

### **REMARKS**

The Examiner is thanked for the thorough examination of the application. This Amendment is being filed concurrent to a Request for Continued Examination (RCE). No new matter is believed to be added to the application by this Response.

### **Status Of The Claims**

Claims 1-11, 12-16 and 19-28 are pending in the application. Claims 1, 12, 27 and 28 are independent. Claims 27 and 28 correspond to claims 1 and 12 and further reflect the Examiner's comments in the Advisory Action of November 6, 2006.

### **Request For Interview**

The Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned below in order to arrange a personal Interview in order to discuss the patentability of the invention in light of the instant claims.

### **Rejections Based On Yoshida**

1. Claims 1-2, 12 and 19-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Yoshida (U.S. Patent 5,936,693) in view of Chang (U.S. Patent 6,166,400), Tadahisa (JP 02-02832) and Kawabe (U.S. Patent 6,162,654).

2. Claims 3-8, 13-16 and 19-23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Yoshida in view of Chang, Tadahisa and Kawabe (as applied to claims 1-2 and 12) and further in view of Ono (U.S. Patent 5,847,781).

3. Claims 24-26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Yoshida in view of Chang, Tadahisa and Kawabe (as applied to claims 1-2 and 12) and further in view of Ono (as applied to claims 3, 4, 6, 13, 14 and 21-23) and further in view of Oyama (U.S. Patent 5,597,668).

Applicants traverse the aforesaid rejections and respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal thereof.

Distinctions of the Invention over the applied art references were set forth in the Response filed October 19, 2006. For brevity, these remarks are not repeated here but are incorporated by reference.

In summary, a black matrix cannot be inserted into the geometry of Yoshida to shield light. Chang, Tadahisa and Kawabe fail to address the inability of Yoshida to disclose or suggest an electrode structure where a black matrix can be inserted between the light source and the TFT on the opposite substrate such that unwanted light reflectance can be prevented. The teachings of Ono and Oyama also fail to address the inability of Yoshida and the other secondary references to suggest independent claims 1 and 12 of the present invention.

In his Response to Arguments at page 2 of the Advisory Action, the Examiner states: "Claims 1 and 12 do not cite 'a black matrix can be inserted between the light source and the TFT on the opposite substrate'. Claims 1 and 12 recite ONLY 'a black matrix formed over the [s]witching element (thin film transistor)'. Therefore, the argument is irrelevant." However, the Examiner should consider claims 27 and 28, which clearly set forth this feature.

As a result, one of ordinary skill in the art would not be motivated by the applied art references to produce claims 1 and 12 of the present invention. A *prima facie* case of  
EHC/REG/ktp

obviousness has thus not been made. Claims depending upon claims 1 and 12 are patentable for at least the above reasons.

These rejections are overcome and withdrawal thereof is respectfully requested.

#### **Foreign Priority**

The Examiner has acknowledged foreign priority and indicated that a certified copy of the priority document has been received in the Office Action mailed February 12, 2002.

#### **The Drawings**

A Drawing Correction Authorization Request was filed on May 10, 2002. The Examiner is respectfully requested to consider this paper and indicate whether the proposed drawing corrections are acceptable in the next official action.

#### **Conclusion**

All of the stated grounds of rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicants therefore respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider all presently outstanding rejections and that they be withdrawn. It is believed that a full and complete response has been made to the final Office Action, and as such, the present application is in condition for allowance.

Prompt and favorable consideration of this Amendment is respectfully requested.

If necessary, the Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and future replies, to charge payment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 02-2448 for any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16 or 1.17; particularly, extension of time fees.

Dated: December 19, 2006

Respectfully submitted,

By Esther Chong  
Esther H. Chong

Registration No.: 40,953

BIRCH, STEWART, KOLASCH & BIRCH, LLP

8110 Gatehouse Road

Suite 100 East

P.O. Box 747

Falls Church, Virginia 22040-0747

(703) 205-8000

Attorney for Applicant

REG